(SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM)

they introduced the circular and the very next day they went out of office. The same thing should not happen to my friend Sri Jatti. He should withdraw that circular. It has come from our Secretary. I request you to instruct him to withdraw it.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—Sir, this is a circular which was issued in response to the wishes of the Hon'ble Members of this House. Whenever we issue the circular, if two or three M.L.As. come, it is not possible for us to execute the tour programme. My friend is making much of it. If the Hon'ble Members are not ready, what shall we do? My friend is fond of making remarks with regard to Ministry and he may enjoy it. But if there are a substantial number of members willing to go on tour, tour will be arranged.

NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTIONS.

Constitution of Standing Committee for each Ministry.

(Debate continued)

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—I said I will try to get more information from the Lok Sabha in regard to this particular matter and place it before this Hon'ble House. I have since been able to get some information about the committees that the Government of India have set up and they are functioning from almost July 1954. The idea was that these committees should provide opportunities to Members of Parliament of knowing the working of the Government Departments and bringing them closer to Government. Sir, it is also realised according to the decision of the Government of India that these committees need not be statutory and no statutory functions are assigned to them. They are informal committees. I am fully aware of it. Then they have formed a number of groups which consist of different political parties. These committees I visualise must consist of different political parties. This is the basis of the formation of these committees in the Government of India and in the Lok Sabha. The aim is that these groups consisting of various political parties should discuss questions of general policy and arrive at a closer understanding of the functioning of the Government. Sir, it is also claimed on behalf of these committees, that they have been able to reduce a number of questions in the Lok Sabha and it has also raised the level of the debate due to closer understanding and better appreciation of the view-points mentioned therein. Well, Sir, it is also mentioned that it is entirely left to the discretion of the Minister concerned so far as secret and very confidential matters relating to Government are concerned, whether they are to be excluded from the purview of some of these committees or not. Some of the committees made use of these confidential information to the detriment of the Governmental interest and that is one of the reasons why very strictly confidential matters are excluded from the purview of these committees. It is also part of the scheme that no question will be officially referred to the Standing Committees or informal representative committees. And then no Government policy or implementation of any scheme will get held up merely because the matter is referred to these committees. Then, Sir, they have also fixed the number of members for each of these committees. They stated that it should not consist of more than 25 to 30 members, adequate representation being given to both Lok Sobha Members and Rajya Sabha Members. Well, Sir, talking of these committees, even before 1954, I understand that the Prime Minister had constituted a Consultative Committee on Foreign Affairs. He had taken that committee into confidence and he had been informing them of the various happenings in the international field which were not otherwise possible to be mentioned either on the floor of the Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha or even otherwise. That shows what great importance has been attached by the Government of India in regard to these particular committees. Sir,

these group meetings, will cost a lot of needless T.A. and for this reason they have devised a system of holding these meetings during sessions of either Rajya Sabha or Lok Sabha or both. The whole idea was to associate the largest number of members belonging to several parties. So, this idea of having 25 to 30 members of the Mysore Legislature will fit in and if each committee consists of not more than 25, there will be representation for all members and there will be progressive association of them with the Government. In regard to the selection of the Members, it might be left to the Legislature itself. But if any particular Minister or Ministers want any particular person or persons to be in a particular group, it is open to the Minister to make a request and that member can be taken in. Sir, this system of committees has been functioning for the last four or five years and periodical assessment has been made as to the result of working of this particular scheme of committees and the way in which it should be fashioned for the future. Such appraisal was made in 1955, that is, one year after and the next appraisal was in 1958. The more recent assessment of the value of the committees was in December 1958 and they have found that this has been a very great success particularly in certain Ministries and they have improved the working of these committees by keeping the Members informed in advance of the subjects to be taken up for discussion by maintaining a brief record of proceedings of the meetings and trying to circularise those records of proceedings to the Members. And for preventing the proceedings from becoming desultory, and to remove the impressions that the Ministers do not want to take the members of the Legislature into confidence, it has been mentioned very specifically by confidential letters to the Ministers concerned that they must speak in regard to matters of public importance with the Members of each of these committees very unreservedly in an atmosphere of goodwill, in an atmosphere of understanding and appreciation of the problems of the country. Sir, the

1-30 P.M.

members are also given the privilege of suggesting subjects for discussion at these meetings. An objection was raised by some members, I understand, that the recording of proceedings is such a waste of time and stationery that to minimise the same only subject headings and specific suggestions or recommendations made by the Members should find a place instead of what the Ministers say. A very important aspect about that is that when these discussions are organised they expect the Ministers, Members and all concerned to come prepared well in advance in regard to the discussions that are to take place. That is one of the reasons why a lot of importance is attached to these meetings. In one of the meetings the Prime Minister is stated to give expression to the feeling that a majority of these committees have functioned very satisfactorily and that they should do all that lies in their power to make these committees more effective and useful. These discussions are intended to exert a certain amount of influence on the general administrative policy and help to promote individual interest and understanding of the problems and they have also got a bearing on the relationship that should exist between the Executive and the Legislature. As I said earlier, in regard to the constitution of these committees, there need not be any rigidity. Even in the Lok Sabha, the Government of India do not constitute these committees either partywise or Housewise. That means that these committees should be fully representative of all political parties is the most primary consideration. In regard to representation it is also mentioned that one person cannot be a member of more than two committees unless it be that the Minister wants him. Even in that case no member of the Legislature can be on more than two committees. On this basis the Government of India have constituted committees for 17 ministries. I shall just give out the names:

Ministry of Commerce and Industry,

Ministry of Communications and Transport,

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

Ministry of Community Development and National Extension,

Ministry of Defence,

Ministry of Education and Scientific Research,

Ministry of External Affairs,

Ministry of Finance,

Ministry of Food and Agriculture,

Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,

Ministry of Health,

Ministry of Home Affairs,

Ministry of Irrigation and Power,

Ministry of Labour and Employment, Planning Commission,

Ministry of Rehabilitation and Minority Affairs,

Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply,

Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel.

I understand that only last week they have added one more to the list of 17 Ministries which have committees.

In a recent communication to the Members of the Parliament it has been stated that the Members should be made to feel that they are playing an effective part in the policy decisions contributing to better administration.

Talking of this administration, if democracy has got to succeed, I am personally of the opinion that there should be a growing recognition of the value of more intimate relations between Government and Members of various parties. We hear lots of criticism on the floor of this House and in the other House against Government measures. Sometimes the criticism is very severe, sometimes it is very cutting. In many cases, I consider, if there is more close relation between the Government and the Members of the Legislature, the rigour of that criticism might be toned down or if a better understanding prevails, possibly, the criticism will be received by the treasury benches in a spirit of understanding rather than in a spirit of defiance as it is at present. It is also the responsibility of the Ministers to make these committees function in a vital manner instead of being constituted merely to satisfy the different political parties. Unless it has a revitalising influence on the Members it is just as well that we do not form these committees.

In regard to the actual type of work that is being done I shall only give two instances to prove how effectively these committees have been functioning. I would like to draw the attention of the House to subjects which figured very prominently in the discussions at a meeting of one of these committees and that relates to the establishment of health centres in the rural areas in the State—the Central Government's contribution to the State and what outlay, if any, the Centre has incurred in regard to functioning of health centres; and the other subject with which I was more intimately concerned and which is near and dear to my heart is the supply of milk and mid-day meals in schools in the villages and the Central Government's contribution towards that—in regard to these two subjects elaborate notes running up to 20 to 23 pages had been furnished to members by the appropriate Ministry. The matter was discussed for two to three hours at the group meetings and then conclusions were reached. While on this subject, I understand that the UNICEF (United Nations International Children's Educational Fund) has instituted a scheme of granting assistance to the establishment of health centres in the different States. I do not know whether in the year 1958-59 all the 50 health centres allotted to the Mysore State were started because in one portion of the note it is stated that many of the States did not take advantage of the scheme. I shall read the relevent portion.

> "Not only is the opening and staffing of the primary health centres in the various States not been according to the original schedule, but most States have also been lagging behind instead of being eligible for drawing UNICEF supplies in full for the centres already opened by them due to

various deficiencies such as lack of buildings, incomplete staff, delay in reporting, etc."

Sri K. K. HEGDE (Minister for Health).—The staff has been sanctioned by Government but for want of buildings the health centres have not been opened.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—All over the State there is a persistent demand for opening more health centres and the United Nations Organisation is prepared to come forward with very generous support. According to the programme Mysore had 50 centres allotted for 1958-59 and even for 1959-60, according to the plan of the Government of India in the Health Department 40 centres have been sanctioned. I am only mentioning this incidentally so that we should not try to forego this opportunity of having health centres established in different parts of the State.

I am drawing the attention of this House to the fact how important these meetings are, and, even if they are not statutory meetings without statutory functions, how much they make the Ministers alive to the responsibility of trying to help the people.

Sri K. K. HEGDE.—If the Government have not been able to start these units it is for want of personnel and buildings.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I wish the Education Minister were here. Now that the Deputy Minister for Education is here, I should like her also to note that in regard to school health service and in regard to school nutritive service,—supply of milk and mid-day meals to children—the Ministry of Education is doing quite a lot and I do not know whether our Government has taken full advantage of the assistance that is extended to us by the Ministry of Education.

I have a lot of material with me, but it is not my purpose to discuss them for the present.

Sir, one of the subjects which provoked lively interest in these committees was about appointment of medical officers to the Lady Hardinge Medical College ; how there was discrimination against women because men were appointed in places where women ought to have been appointed. Hon'ble Members are aware that in our own State appointments in connection with the integrated courses in Manipal College was one of the subjects which figured prominently, particularly during question-time in the House. For want of time and various other reasons, the Members have been unable to obtain full information on the subject. In view of this, if the meetings suggested by me are held, the Government's point of view would be better understood, the Members would feel that they have obtained as much knowedge as is possible and the Ministers could take the Members of various parties into confidence.

Sir, the Mysore State has been a pioneer in setting up these committees as far back as 1923 in response to the recommendations made by that great intellectual giant Brajendranath Seal. The standing committees have rendered very distinguished service in promoting cordial relations between members of various parties of the Legislature and the Government and this system has led to a lot of fruitful work in the best interests of the country. In saying that these committees should be set up, I do not want to be rigid that they should be statutory bodies or be called 'Standing Committees'. Let them be called Informal Consultative Committees, but there should be as many committees as there are Ministries. I do hope that these committees would be able to secure that co-operation which is so essential for the successful functioning of democracy in the State. With these few words, I commend the Resolution for the acceptance of the House.

†Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—I endorse the idea put forward by my friend Sri Mallaradhya. At the same time I have given notice of an amendment to the Resolution to the effect that the standing committees may be confined to the Finance Department. I may straightaway say that the intention of the amendment

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

was to see that it secures easy acceptance. I know the stock argument that would be advanced against the constitution of the committee—that it would lead to interference in the working of the department. My friend Sri Mallaradhya has already furnished a reply to such an argument. In any case, taking into account the opposition likely for the constitution of committees for all the departments, I have suggested that for the present we begin with a committee for the Finance Department. That can be given a fair trial. The Finance Department is the most essential, vital department, which exercises a sort of supervisory control over all other departments. With the experience we gain in the working of this committee, we can extend it to other departments and sectors.

Sir, the setting up of these committees would be in the best interests of parliamentary traditions. Apart from the Government of India, even England has such committees. For example, Standing Order No. 57 of the House of Commons definitely provides for standing committees. These committees, so far as England is concerned, have very wide functions. They function in all departments. They go into financial details, and working of the administrative and other departments. This institution has been in vogue for over three centuries and it has rendered yeoman service.

Another argument that may be advanced is that as the Estimates and Public Accounts Committees already go into such questions, why duplicate them? My respectful submission is that such an impression is totally incorrect. Even the Lok Sabha has Estimates and Public Accounts Committees, nonetheless, the standing committees are there. Therefore the argument that this body would be redundant is *prima facie* incorrect. I have already quoted the instance of the House of Commons. There too the Estimates and Public Accounts Committees function, apart from the tanding committees.

Recently, the Kerala Administrative Reforms Committee which reviewed the administrative system after taking into account the several integrating administrative systems, have recommended the setting up of standing committees consisting of non-officials, especially with respect to Finance Department. I must also point out that the Estimates and Public Accounts Committees only do post-mortem work. Under rules 250 and 253 of our Rules of Procedure, the functions of these committees are only to examine accounts and the appropriation of sums already granted by the Assembly. They go into particular items of expenditure, which have already been incurred and which would have been approved by this House. Their recommendations may or may not be accepted by the Government. We are well aware that several recommendations of these committees have been ignored by Government on several occasions for several reasons. When I suggest a committee for the Finance Department, what I have in mind is that it should scrutinise budget proposals before they enter into the framework of the budget. I am not saying that it should actually formulate proposals, because that would lead to technical difficulties. But the economies sought to be made might be a matter which can come before the committee.

It is also necessary to note our own experience in regard to the budget. We know that even after the budget is passed by us, the sanction or the approval of the Finance Department is again to be sought for the expenditure and that is the reason why there is so much delay in the implementation of the several schemes. The budget is passed by the end of March, but the sanctions are not communicated up to July or August or September in some cases.

SRI T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—This year we communicated the sanctions on the 1st of April 1959 itself.

SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN.—You might have done it only this year. Sometimes, there is the practice of asking for lump sum grants and such practice is not ruled out. So lump sum grants are likely to be demanded in future. In such an event doubts

may arise and queries are likely to be raised by the administrative departments for clarification by the Finance Department thus leading to delay.

We also know that expenditure on administrative staff is mounting up day by day. One of our fears is that the number of posts might be increased without reference to economy and the quantum of work and without reference to the particular plan in view. This is human tendency and this has happened in the case of almost all governments. Therefore we want that such items of unnecessary expenditure should be stopped. For this purpose a standing committee of finance as suggested by me becomes very necessary. Taking the overall position you find that the Government of India also have resorted to such standing committees in the past. Recently, an eminent person like Sri Santhanam, Chairman of the former Finance Commission, also has made the very same recommendation for a standing finance committee. So far as this government is concerned, at least his recommendation deserves due consideration. Then, Sir, as pointed out my by friend, the Government of India also are taking recourse to administrative committees. So far as the House of Commons is concerned, this is not a new provision and it is there in vogue for several years. Lastly, the Kerala Administrative Reforms Committee also have made a recommendation to the effect that there should be a standing finance committee consisting of non-officials to check the expenditure in the course of the coming years.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Chikodi).—Is the resuch a committee in the House of Commons also ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Yes. Standing Order No. 57 of the House of Commons provides for standing committees. The nature of the standing committees has varied from time to time.

Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN (Deputy Minister for Finance).—Is it that the entire House sits as committee ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—There are several types of committees. One is that the entire House constitutes itself into one committee where the Speaker does not preside but some other member presides, but there is another type of committee and that is covered by standing order No. 38. The standing committee that I am having in mind consists of 15 or 17 members and such a committee will go into several questions like financial matters.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—The point is whether these standing committees are associated with the day to day administra ion or whether they are constituted only for certain specific functions.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I have given a specific amendment to the resolution and my amendment is confined to the Finance Department. It is not that there is no precedent for it in our country. I quoted also the recommendation of the Kerala Administrative Reforms Committee in this respect.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Even in Kerala such a committee has not yet been set up; it is only a recommendation.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—But the recommendation is under examination by the Kerala Government. As regards the point raised by Sri Kothavale, the House of Commons has got standing committees and they are constituted under S.O. 57. The standing committee that I am suggesting is different from the Estimates Committee or the Public Accounts Committee which have specific functions, namely, to go into economies in expenditure after the budget is passed, but my amendment wants to have a standing committee to go into economies in expenditure even before the budget is passed in order to see that expenditure is curtailed and the various plan items are properly pruned. It is for this purpose that the Kerala Committee has made this recommendation. They knew fully well that the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee were there which would go into economies in expenditure after the budget is passed, but if you want to cut down the expenditure on the everexpanding staff that can be done only by a standing committee of the type suggested by me which can

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

scrutinise the budget items generally even before the budget is passed. I am not saying that the entire budget will be scrutinised by such a committee beforehand, but such a committee can surely scrutinise the expenditure on staff even before the budget is passed. There is also precedent for the type of committee that I am suggesting.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The committee that you suggest is entirely different from the one suggested by Sri Mallaradhya.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—That is why I say that if you are not prepared to accept the type of committee suggested by Sri Mallaradhya, at least accept the type of committee suggested by me and accept my amendment. I know that some objection will be raised to the committee contemplated by Sri Mallaradhya and there may be some objection for that, but there cannot be any objection to the type of standing committee suggested by me in my amendment.

2 P.M.

The sum and substance of Sri Mallaradhya's argument is that if the Government of India suggest committees, what prevents this Government from having these committees. He gave a number of instances where there were precedents. Apart from the Government of India's attitude, is there not a justification on merits? There is justification. Take the House of Commons; take Kerala Committee's recommendation. It is the view of eminent persons like Sri K. S. Santhanam who is considered as well versed in financial matters and who filled the post of Chairman of the Finance Commission. There is weight of authority. Certainly there is also urgency for that. The urgency is this. We are engaged on a Plan with the expenditure increasing Especially in the Third Five-Year Plan the expenditure is likely to go up very high. In such an expanding economy, in an economy engaged in developmental outlay on an ever-increasing scale, that is the tendency noticed in China, in non-communist countries, even in U.K. or any other democratic country.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Now the question of bringing together both the Opposition and the Party in power is not seen anywhere, except in one or two cases where a non-party question is involved.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If you stand by your provisions there is no reason why you should appoint such committees. Especially when there is emphasis laid on the total amount of money spent rather than on the achievement of physical targets, the tendency would be not to care so much for economy. That is No 1. No. 2: There is also the tendency to take as much of staff as possible in order to finish off the work; it is not anything new to us. We are aware that last year and the year before because of the delays in financial sanction and all that during the close of the financial year, a lot of expenditure was incurred in a great hurry. It would make any one to draw a reasonable inference that economy was sacrificed. The Report of the Public Accounts Committee has definitely shown that such a thing has happened. When there is a developmental economy, when the expenditure is increasing and when the staff is likely to increase, when that is the position, it is absolutely necessary that as many safeguards as are humanly possible should be retained for the cutting down of expenditure. One of the methods to achieve this is to have a standing committee which is to scrutinise all proposals for new expenditure, new service, etc. The administrative delay after the budget is passed will be reduced to zero.

One other very important argument is this. That also pertains to the manner in which the budget is presented. As you are aware, our budget is not what is called performance budget. It only indicates financial outlays and nothing more. From our scrutiny of the budget we will not be able to find out whether there are physical targets. In fact, this matter came before one of the Estimates Committees of Parliament and they also suggested that the presentation of the budget itself should

be changed and the manner in which the budget is indicated should be changed so as to give an idea of what is in the performance budget, that is, the physical target achieved in the year and all that. Taking that also into account, it is absolutely necessary that a standing committee of the type envisaged by me should be constituted by the Government associating as many people as is possible from this House—it may be a very small number; it may include as many members of the Opposition as the Government want; I am insisting that it should consist of a majority of members of the Opposition. If such a committee is constituted, this House will be assured of proper democratic control of expenditure at the time of the presentation of the budget. Therefore, I commend the resolution.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I rise to oppose the resolution. The resolution is very vague and the necessity for it is almost nil and it is against the parliamentary form of Government which we are adopting in this country. It is clear that it does not in any way alter the scope of the standing committee—the functions and powers. The only function that is stated in the resolution is of an advisory nature—'to advise the Government on the administration of the department concerned.' In the absence of precise details it is not possible to correctly assess the effect of such a resolution and the impact on the administration it is likely to have. Secondly, in my view, such committees are redundant. I know there were such committees created in the Parliament of India prior to 1952. But the latest information appears to be that these committees have been abolished in 1952.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).—May I know why they were abolished?

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Because they were not found useful, they did not make for efficiency—for several reasons. As to why they were abolished is the question the Hon'ble Member should put to the Government of India. What I state is a matter of inference so far as my knowledge goes. Now the point is whether such committees are going to serve any purpose. In the Bombay Legislature certain study circles were organized; they were confined to the party in power; that is, the Congress Party. Similarly it appears that there are certain standing committees organized even at the Centre by the Congress Party, but they are not standing committees appointed either by the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha, but they are appointed by the Congress Party for taking suggestions from the members who form those committees and practically to give a sort of training to the members. But it is not correct to say that the standing committees to which a reference was made by Sri Mallaradhya were committees of the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha; they had nothing to do with either the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha; they were organized by the party in power. This argument may be considered as to whether it is justified or not. We may consider about the utility of the standing committees suggested by Sri Mallaradhya. The administration of a State consists of two parts. It may be a question of principle and policy and the other is actual administration from day to day. The policy and principle, of course, are presented to the Houses and it is always open to the Hon'ble Members to have their say on this matter. No special committees are needed. But as to the association of the standing committee of this House with the administration, the difficulty would be whether it is possible for the Government to lay before the standing committee all papers, whether confidential or not, and whether it is possible to have consultations with the committee about day to day administration. That will certainly hamper the working of the Ministry concerned, because at every stage if the Minister were to consult such a committee, it would be practically impossible for him to go on with the administration. When the principal question is to carry out the policy approved by the House, to put into effect the principles approved by the House, it is a question of implementation of these policies and

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE)

principles that the Ministry is concerned with.

Therefore, from the point of view of practical working of such committees, it is not possible that the committees can be entrusted with examining the practicalities of administration and it will be practically hampering the work of execution which can best be done by the Minister in charge because execution is a matter which should be left to one man and it cannot be left to a large number of persons assembled in a committee. That does not make administration efficient or anything of the type. Therefore, from the utility point also, it is not possible to constitute such committees. Now, Sir, what is the legal position? I stated in the beginning that these committees are opposed to the form of Government adopted in this country. We have adopted parliamentary form of Government. There are two or three parties contesting elections on definite election manifestes and certain principles and policies are placed before the electors to consider and they vote and when a particular party is elected on the basis of a manifesto, it is the bounden duty of the party in power to carry out the promises given by the party at the time of election. Therefore, the question of referring policies to such standing committees does not arise. Therefore, to entrust matters of administration to a committee consisting of all members of the House is inconceivable in the parliamentary form of Government. Therefore, the resolution conceived by the Hon'ble Sri Mallaradhya, is, I think, against the very spirit and letter of parliamentary system of Government that our Constitution has adopted. Therefore, it is not possible.

There are one or two matters which can be considered in connection with these standing committees. There are certain matters which can be counted as non-party matters; for instance, regarding foreign policy, even in America they follow a sort of bi-partisan policy. Both parties are associated with the formation of foreign policy. Even in England, the Leader of the Opposition is taken into confidence for purpose of having a sort of specific policy respecting questions that arise from day to day. That is a matter with respect to the nation and the people outside the country itself. It is a good practice to have a sort of common policy whether one party comes into power or other party comes into power, so that there may be a sort of continuity, with respect to foreign affairs. But the same unanimity cannot be expected with regard to home affairs because there are parties with varying programmes and policies. Therefore it is not possible, Sir, to have a committee consisting of all elements of this House to be associated with the administration. The result will be practically a sort of chaos in the administration. It is against parliamentary system to appoint such committees. There is one other matter which we have made a non-party question in this country and that relates to food problem. At the centre a committee has been appointed consisting of all important elements in the Parliament to advise Government on food policy. A suggestion has been made to form such committees at the State level. It is possible to have a committee to advise the Government with regard to policies and programmes to be adopted in regard to procurement of foodgrains, controls and all that. We can understand these questions being treated as non-party questions, but with respect to other matters, it is inconceivable to have a committee consisting of all elements of the House. Now, Sir, the parties in this political set up work in a peculiar way. For instance, the Congress Party has formed the Governmernt. Whenever certain policies or principles, or particular bills or resolutions come up, it is a matter of common knowledge that such questions come up before the party for discussion, and the party in consonance with the policies and principles of the party will take decisions and, of course, the Government works them out. Then the question arises whether the Opposition Members have got a right or opportunity to make a contribution towards the efficiency of the administration and

towards other matters with which the administration is concerned. There are various ways in which the Opposition is associated with the administration. We should not forget the functions of the legislature particularly modern legislature. Formerly, these legislatures were mainly concerned with the work of legislation. So far as our Constitution is concerned, our legislature is not merely a legislative body, but it controls the Government in several ways. There is financial control. When the budget is presented it is open to the House to discuss and debate the various aspects of the budget. It is open to the House to disallow any particular demand ; it is open to the House to make any suggestions with respect to other matters. So, in effect, this House has got financial control over the affairs of the State.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM (Kolar Gold Fields).—Every democratic Government in the world has got some procedure that we are having in our State.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—The Hon'ble Member is right. That was not so before. The Hon'ble Member might see the history of the legislature. The functions originally were merely legislative. Now, the legislature is assuming more and more powers and it is as a result of that we are having financial control of the Government. We have got administrative control of the Government also. By putting questions and other things, we can make suggestions. Similarly, whenever questions come up, it is the right of the Hon'ble Members to participate in the debate and make suggestions and by means of such resolutions bind the Government if they are accepted by this Hon'ble House. There are various ways of doing these things. The most important instruments of control are the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee. The Hon'ble Member Sri Narasimhan said that these committees do a sort of *post mortem* examination. It is not correct. As a matter of fact, the function of the Estimates Committee is to examine the budget estimates and suggest economies even before the expenditure is made. The Hon'ble Member Sri Narasimhan might read the rule No. 251 of the Rules of Procedure which mentions the functions of Estimates Committee. It says :

"The functions of the Committee shall be-

(*a*) to report what economies, improvements in organisation, efficiency or administrative reform, consistent with the policy underlying the estimates, may be effected ;

(*b*) to suggest alternative policies in order to bring about efficiency and economy in administration ;

(*c*) to examine whether the money is well laid out within the limits of the policy implied in the estimates ; and

(*d*) to suggest the form in which the estimates shall be presented to the Legislature."

Well, the functions of the Estimates Committee shows that it is not a *post mortem* examinination but an examination even before the expenditure is being incurred. That is the position. It cannot be said to be a sort of *post mortem* examination. That may be true about the Public Accounts Committee but not of the Estimates Committee. These are very effective means at our disposal to control the Government and to suggest economy, to suggest efficiency and to do all other things which the Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya has in view in moving this resolution. Therefore, as I say, this House has got ample opportunites and powers of controlling the Government and therefore no such committees are needed. These committees, if at all constituted, will be study circles doing no particularly useful work. I was told there were certain standing committees in the Old Mysore State and I do not know what happened to them. Probably they were abolished because they did not discharge useful functions. Certain examples were given by the Hon'ble Member Sri Mallaradhya regarding the functioning of health centres. On matters such as food or foreign affairs

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE)

there cannot be any dispute. In regard to other matters, as I said in my speech earlier, we cannot go against the policies underlying the parliamentary form of Government.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is it the suggestion of the member that what is now being done in the Government is against the parliamentary system of Government contemplated in a democracy?

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I have my information. Either he must be wrong or I must be wrong. My information is that such committees to which the Hon'ble Member made a reference were abolished in the year 1952. I may tell him that such standing committees which are now constituted were constituted by the Congress Parliamentary party, not by the Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha. The membership of these committees is confined to the members of the ruling party.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I shall read a letter dated December 58 convening all the members of the political parties to the committee which I referred. It is being done even today in the year of Grace 1959 on 20th April, these committees in the Central Government are functioning.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—The Hon'ble Member is not correct. I think the Hon'ble Minister may give more information. In certain matters Government may take into confidence the members of the Opposition.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I merely stated that even today the Committees are functioning.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I think the resolution is vague. It will degenerate into study circles and it will hamper the work of the administration and it is also against the spirit of parliamentary democracy. I therefore oppose the resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Is the Hon'ble Member going to reply?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Mover of the resolution has a right to reply. Let the Minister first reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—You may reply. Afterwards the Minister will reply.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, some very urgent work took me away in the middle of the debate. I meant no disrespect either to my friend Sri Narasimhan or Sri Kothavale. From the tenor of the spech of Sri Kothavale I learn that he considers these committees as being against the spirit of democracy, that they are not in consonance with the parliamentary traditions of Government. I am afraid, whether these committees are functioning in the Government of India or not, it is a question of fact that they have not been abolished. I have documentary evidence with me at the present moment to prove one hundred per cent that these committees are functioning and that they have not been abolished even today, and particularly with regard to foreign affairs, even before 1954 the Consultative Committee on Foreign Affairs was one of the institutions by which the Prime Minister.....

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I said that in matters of foreign affairs and food policy they are not treated as party questions. If the Member was present, I said that in America they have developed a policy—that is also the policy in England—where these subjects are treated as non-party questions. My learned friend should not confuse one with the other.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The confusion is in the mind of Sri Kothavale. I know that food and foreign affairs are both national issues and there is no question of party business in that. But we do have a long list of committees formed by the Central Government which run into 18. There is no important branch of the administration of the Government of India which is excluded from the purview of the constitution of these committees. For information I shall read the names of the committees functioning as on 18th December 1958 unless subsequent to that date these committees are abolished by an order of Government.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—The question is about membership.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—These committees do consist of members of parties. I make this very emphatic statement and I am prepared to take a challenge. This information I have got from members of Parliament who are functioning on these committees. I am quite prepared to place all the cards on the table to prove against the argument which my friend Sri Narasimhan also anticipated, that these will interfere with the administration and that at best they will be like a study circle. Even granting that these committees will turn out to be study circles, what is wrong in it? It will give our Ministers a lot of education which they need very badly.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—Do they require education ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If the Minister objects to my remark I will withdraw. I shall leave it at that. Further, my friend Sri Narasimhan by his suggestion has given a very substantial support in regard to the passing of this resolution.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Qualified support.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—He has accepted it in principle. His argument is that that there was such a committee in Kerala and when once you take care of the finances everything will be taken care of. The point is, let alone the foreign policy, matters concerning health, supply of milk and providing mid-day meals should not be made party issues. I shall read out extracts prepared by the Ministry of Health in regard to the setting up of health units throughout the State, in regard to distribution of milk to childreu and providing mid-day meals in schools, etc. These are not matters which are alien to any administrative department. What I say is this: what is it that Government is going to lose by accepting this resolution unless it be a question of prestige? The question of economy and expenditure is there because you hold these meetings; each Ministry holds at least two meetings — that is a mandate—during the sessions. Only questions of major policy, questions which are affecting the administration of the departments—whether it is Finance, L.S.G., or even Industries and Commerce—are discussed. Take any department ; I can fully justify the constitution of these committees by saying " look at the industrial progress of this State. Do you mean to say that committees of the Industries and Commerce Dapartment will not bring more fruitful results to the State ? "

Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO (Basavangudi).—If the Hon'ble Member will yield : There is a Development Council for Industries of which my friend Sri Mallaradhya is a member.

2-30 P.M.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Even there two heads are better than one. It is only rarely that Members of the Opposition get a chance to get into such committees and councils. The way in which these committees are constituted, the preponderant element is the Congressman. Opposition Members are there like oasis in a desert. What we are trying to envisage in this resolution is only participation in the administration or an attempt to tone up the administration. Let them not think that this is tantamount to needless interference. Supposing Government wants to initiate a policy in regard to floating of loans, utilisation of loans for specific purposes, for granting loans to industrialists or starting of new industries ; these are matters on which a majority of members have no chance of speaking on the floor of the House. Many points are not being discussed for want of time. What is wrong about the Government agreeing to give a chance to Members to participate in the functioning of the administration? In any case, if the Government of India's practice is against accepted notions of democracy, I shall leave it to the conscience of the Government or the Minister concerned.

Sri Kothavale said that the Committees appointed in 1923 in Mysore were abolished subsequently because they did not function well. I think he is trying to present a wrong picture. I was myself associated with two or three administrative committees in the old set up.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—On a point of clarification. What I said was that if the Members of the Legislature participate in administration, there would be double mistakes. They eannot then criticise their own actions in this House. Secondly, the function of the Oppositon is to see that Government functions properly. If they too enter into the sphere of administration, how can they fulfil the role assigned to them ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, the Member is trying to make an uncharitable construction of my remarks. I am surprised that Sri Kothavale does not appreciate adequately the position of the Opposition in the functioning of democracy. Will democracy at all be a success without an effective Opposition ? What is democracy without an Opposition ? It would be a sort of undiluted autocracy. Does the Hon'ble Member suggest that the Opposition parties will drive at the thin end of the wedge by getting into the details of administration ? They have a thousand ways of getting information about the administration. Does the Hon'ble Member suggest that the various criticisms made in this House, supported by hard facts and figures, are drawn from mere imagination ? They have many sources of obtaining details of the administtion.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I did not say any such thing. I only said that the Opposition would be forgetting its constitutional duty as an Opposition, if they too enter into the field of administration.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If I get into the Committees, the Opposition would be more effective- The Members would get facts and then they will be in a position to talk in a constructive manner. Many a time, they have to criticise for want of sufficient information. I think that at the back of Sri Kothavale's mind he is trying to screen the ruling party. He thinks that if Opposition gets more facts, they will become stronger. If that is his grievance, I do not mind his opposing this resolution.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—It is absolutely an incorrect inference.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—At least that is what Sri K. Santhanam said and that is why it was suspended.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I would not like to go into a few more matters, because I do not want to make them public.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—May I know from the Hon'ble Member if the Foreign Affairs Committee has in it any member of the Opposition ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—From some of the letters I have, which are of a confidential nature, I can say that these committees have adequate representation of all the groups functioning in Parliament, including the Communist group.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—As far as I know, there is no Member from the Opposition in the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am sorry I do not have a list of the members in the several committees, but this is definite that even in the Foreign Affairs Commitee, there are Opposition Members. If the Hon'ble Member is interested he can approach Sri Krishnaswamy, son of Dr. A. Ramaswamy Mudaliar. He will be able to give a list of persons serving in the various committees.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, I am sorry my friend is mistaken. Foreign relations is the concern of the ruling Congress party. I know perfectly well that no non-Congressman is a Member of this particular Committee. I know Dr. Krishnaswamy, Sri Shivraj and many other Members of Parliament and it is not necessary that I should see Dr. Krishnaswamy for this purpose.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have read the report on the working of the informal consultative committees consisting of Members of Parliament during the current year. The report is dated 20th November 1958 and it says that they have been reasonably active and are serving a very useful purpose. These committees were formed at the instance of Cabinet to provide an informal forum for a free and frank discussion between the Ministers, Members of Parliament and officials. The report reads : "I need hardly tell you

how much the Prime Minister appreciates the successful working of the Foreign Relations Committee, which is fully representative of all the political parties in the country". So this makes it clear that even Opposition Members find a place in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Sir, I want the Government to examine the problem on merits and its usefulness. I am not particularly bothered whether I am going to get into the committees or whether any Member of the Opposition will get into it. If the Government could see reason, if they think that such committees could function usefully and if they want to set an example.....

Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO.—Is there not a subtle difference between the Foreign Affairs Committee and other Committees?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—According to the wordings used by the Hon'ble Member himself, it is only an informal consultative committee.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I definitely said that these committees could be informal. I am not suggesting that they should be statutory committees having statutory functions.

In conclusion, I would say that I am prepared to accept the formation of these committees, even if admission is restricted to Congress Members only.

†Sri T. MARIAPPA.—Sir, I am indeed grateful for the very valuable suggestions made during the discussion on this Resolution. The Resolution is worded like this:

> "This Assembly is of the opinion that a Standing Committee for each Ministry be constituted consisting of not more than seven members of the Legislature with the Minister in-charge of the portfolio, to advise Government on the administration of the Department concerned."

The wording of the Resolution is not very happy, if according to my friend, the whole thing should be on the plane of consultation. It is true that in old Mysore, there were standing committees on 1. Railways, Electrical and Public Works Departments, 2. Local Self-Government, Medical, Sanitation and Health Committees, 3. Finance and Taxation.

Sir, Sri Mallaradhya is a product of the old Mysore Civil Service. Naturally we must give a little margin if he is fond of the old order. These Committees were set up at a time when the Government was irremoveble and was not responsive. The Government was not amenable to the vote of the Legislature.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What about the committees in Sri K. C. Reddy's time?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I will come to that.

There was some justification for the constitution of these committees then. After the Constitution of India came into force on 26th January 1950, the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council ceased to function and along with it the standing committees. But in January 1951, as a provisional measure, Government constituted, by an executive order, eleven committees, *viz.*, Finance, Agriculture, Food and Civil Supplies, Education, Electricity, Public Works, Medical and Public Health, Local Self-Government, Industries and Commerce, Labour, Rural Development, Co-operation and Publicity. Each Committee consisted of Six members with the Minister in charge as the Chairman of the Committee. These Committees functioned only for a short period. On the 14th June 1952 another order was passed directing that the term of the Standing Committees shall expire on the date on which the Provisional Legislative Assembly functioning under Article 385 of the Constitution of India ceases to function. It will be seen from this that these committees were there only for a brief term and they did not function properly. These committees did not function properly because they were said to be standing committees for each department with a view to advise the department on administrative matters. It is not necessary for me to say why they did not function well because that has

(SRI T. MARIAPPA)

been clearly explained by my friend Sri Kothavale. At times certain information which was asked to be kept as very confidential had leaked out and there were also interferences in the actual working of the departments. So after 1952 these committees were not revived.

We should not forget at the same time that there are two very vital committees of this House functioning. One is the Public Accounts Committee and the other is the Estimates Committee. I do not subscribe to the view that the Estimates Committee or the Public Accounts Committee is only doing *post mortem* examination. It is not so. On the other hand the scope of the Estimates Committee is very wide. It can not only lay down policies but also examine the policies in force and suggest reorientation of such policies. They can even go into the whole question of finance. They can even go into the schemes already in force and suggest amendments. As the House is aware the Estimates Committee has got very wide powers and in the Lok Sabha the Estimates Committee has made several recommendations touching the Government policies.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—They have gone to the extent of suggesting that Bhadravati may be made a centre for production of special steel even though it was not within their jurisdiction.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I am aware of that. In fact, when the Estimates Committee of Lok Sabha came over here I met a few members of the Committee. That is why I said that the Estimates Committee has got ample powers to suggest what is feasible and useful and what should be the policy of Government. These two committees are really very powerful committees. The Standing Committees envisaged by the resolution will not serve the purpose for which they are intended because now we are working in a new set-up where the policies are adumbrated by the ruling party. The policy is not of the House put together. Sri Arumugham was right in saying that all the parties cannot sit together and formulate policies. The question of foreign policy is different because so far as foreign policy is concerned it should represent the cumulative wisdom of the entire nation because there we are dealing with foreign nations and to that extent it would be proper even if members of the Opposition also are invited for informal consultation. To ask for informal consultation is one thing and to ask for the setting up of standing advisory committees for each department is quite a different thing. Suffice it to say that the setting up of standing committees will not help in the formulation of policies based on party government. In any parliamentary democracy it is the majority party which lays down certain policies. In the light of the criticism of the opposition we may even change and to that extent you will be nullifying parliamentary rule, So, Sir, it will not be helpful if standing committees are set up for each administrative unit and the standing committee members are asked to advise on administrative matters and on matters which should be kept as confidential.

There is another danger also. Suppose the advice of standing committees is not accepted. It would create a very embarrassing situation and the ruling party would have to face very severe opposition if the advice of the standing committees is rejected.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Challakere).—When there were standing committees they were effectively functioning. At that time my friend Sri Mariappa was in the opposition.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I have already dealt with that. In fact, at that time such committees were needed because the executive was irremoveable and so in order to placate the opposition they used to constitute standing committees. I know that in 90 cases out of 100 the advice tendered was never accepted. I was a member of the Standing Finance Committee and I know how the Chairman of that committee used to listen to us and how ultimately they used to have their say.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Was it a responsive form of Government.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—The Government was irremovable and it was also not responsible.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Challakere).—The system that was obtaining then was in no way inferior to the system that is obtaining today. The executive was responsive and responsible. I might say that the system of standing committees was a better system because thereby you will get the view of the opposition without having to call for it. The views of the opposition in the standing committees will be helpful to the executive at times. If the advice of the opposition proved wrong, then the executive can say, "Your advice was wrong". On the other hand, if the advice is good, we can accept and there will be no harm in doing that. So I am of opinion that standing committees will be helpful

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—My Hon'ble friend must remember that I am now replying to the debate. I thought that he just wanted to put a question, but he is now making a speech.

It should not be forgotten that besides the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee there are other committees constituted by the Government. There is the Committee on Assurances, where the promises held out by Government will be examined as to what extent they have been fulfilled and a report laid on the Table of the House. There is also the State Development Council, Industries Development Council, Malnad Development Committee, Committees for Handlooms, Handicrafts, etc. Whenever a need is felt, ad hoc committees are set up for certain specific purposes. Apart from that, to set up standing committees for each administrative unit would not be acceptable.

A question about the Standing Finance Committees in the House of Commons was raised. Regarding the position there, I have got the latest telegram from the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs.

This is dated 11th April 1959. The Standing Advisory Committees for Ministries are not functioning; they were abolished in 1952.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My friend is misquoting. I referred to informal consultative committees functioning today. I am prepared to bow down. Instead of standing committees, informal committees may be set up. He should not misquote.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I merely read out the telegram received from the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. Therefore, I state that the resolution as worded is not at all acceptable to the House.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—By way of compromise I said very clearly; even now I have not moved an amendment. I said what is the practice obtaining in the Government of India.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—That is the reason why I specifically read out the resolution. The resolution as it is worded is not acceptable. It is open to the Hon'ble Member to bring in a resolution for the constitution of consultative committees. When my friend Sri Kothavale attacked the whole resolution from his own point of view, he made out a very good case that what Sri Mallaradhya contemplated under the resolution is not possible and it is not functioning either in the Lok Sabha or here.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—How about the House of Commons?

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—In the House of Commons there are standing advisory committees to scrutinise legislation and bills and there are no departmental standing committees even in U.K., so far as U.K. Parliament is concerned. My friend Sri M. C. Narasimhan referred to what was happening in Kerala. With regard to the fact which he referred to I may definitely say that even the Kerala Government has not adopted that procedure as yet; they have not set up standing committees. That is the recommendation made by the Finance Advisory Committee and it is still under consideration. It is too much to expect that the Government of Kerala is going to accept the recommendation of that Committee. Therefore, from

(SRI T. MARIAPPA)

any point of view, the resolution as worded is not acceptable. In the light of what I have explained, I hope Sri Mallaradhya will withdraw the resolution.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—May I have a clarification at least? Supposing this resolution as it is worded is passed; is it incumbent on the Government to implement it in the same fashion, or only take the spirit?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may say whether he is pressing or withdrawing his amendment.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—So far as my amendment is concerned, I am pressing it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

'That in line 2 for the words "for each Ministry", substitute the words "for the Finance Ministry".'

'That in lines 4 and 5, for the words "Department concerned", substitute "Finance Department".'

The motion was negatived.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—This is the one occasion on which I am dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister. It is absolutely unconvincing. He has made a capital out of the words of the resolution. My point is, my purpose would be served if the Government will take note of all the ideas conveyed in the resolution and the practice obtaining in the Government of India to-day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That this Assembly is of the opinion that a Standing Committee for each Ministry be constituted consisting of not more than seven members of the Legislature with the Minister in-charge of the portfolio, to advise Government on the administration of the Department concerned."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.— The House now rises and meets again after half an hour.

———

The House adjourned for Lunch at Fifty-five Minutes past Two of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

———

[DR. R. NAGAN GOWDA in the Chair]

Resolution No. 1—Formation of Corporation of Silk Industries.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಲಿಂಗೇಗೌಡ (ಕನಕಪುರ).—ನಭೆಯು ಮುಂದೆ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಇಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

"This Asembly is of the opinion that suitable steps be taken immediately to form a Corporation of Silk Industries in the State comprising all filature factories, Spun Silk Factory and Government Weaving Factory."

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA).— Resolution moved:

"This Assembly is of the opinion that suitable steps be taken immediately to form a Corporation of Silk Industries in the State comprising all filature factories, Spun Silk Factory and Government Weaving Factory."

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—I wish to move an amendment to the Resolution as follows:—

'In line 2 for the word "Corporation" substitute the word "autonomous Board".'

Mr. CHAIRMAN.—Amendment moved:

'In line 2 for the word "Corporation" substitute the word "autonomous Board".'

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಲಿಂಗೇಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ರೇಷ್ಮೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ಈ ನಭೆಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೊದಲು, ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ತಯಾರಾಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೇಷ್ಮೆ ಪ್ರಪಂಚದಲ್ಲಿ ಅತ್ಯುತ್ತಮವಾದುದ್ದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಲು ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣಗಳು ಇಷ್ಟ. ಮೈಸೂರು ರೇಷ್ಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಲಸ್ಟರ್ (ಹೊಳಪು) ಇನ್ನಾವ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ತಯಾರಾಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ರೇಷ್ಮೆ